

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/777,121	(02/05/2001	Shanta Modak	A32359-A	8537	
21003	7590	02/24/2003				
BAKER & BOTTS				EXAMINER		
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				KENNEDY,	KENNEDY, SHARON E	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3763		
				DATE MAILED: 02/24/2003	}	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/777,121

Applicant(s)

Modak et al.

Examiner

Sharon Kennedy

Art Unit 3763



The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period for Reply	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 mailing date of this communication. 	8 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
Status	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ T	his action is non-final.
	vance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is a Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	
4) 🔀 Claim(s) <u>22-29</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
	is/are allowed.
6) 💢 Claim(s) <u>22-29</u>	is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Application Papers	
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on	is/are a) \square accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in	reply to this Office action.
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for for	reign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:	•
1. \square Certified copies of the priority document	nts have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority document	nts have been received in Application No
application from the Internation	
*See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for do	
a) U The translation of the foreign language pro	
	mestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	6) Other:

Application/Control Number: 09/777,121 Page 2

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action or the MPEP.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The prior art considered in the parent application 09/281,872, has been considered herein. Applicant should submit a PTO-Form 1449 listing those references.

Double Patenting

- 3. Claims 22-29 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,083,208. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patent is also directed to a gel (polyurethane) in combination with a metal compound and triclosan.
- 4. Claims 22-29 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26, 31-33, 45-55 of U.S. Patent No. 6,106,505. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patent is also directed to a gel (polyurethane) in combination with a metal compound and triclosan.
- 5. Claims 22-29 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23, 28-30 of U.S. Patent No. 5,772,640.

 Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other

Art Unit: 3763

Page 3

because the patent is also directed to a gel (polyurethane) in combination with a metal compound

and triclosan.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. Claims 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Modak,

US 5,567,495. Modak discloses triclosan in column 7, line 45, various silver antibiotics and in

addition, polyurethane, silicone, polyethylene oxide, e.g., which for gels, as additives to the

treatment solution. See, for example, column 14, lines 55+. The weight percents claimed are

broad and disclosed by Modak. Accordingly, the claims are anticipated. Regarding claim 24.

note that Modak discloses that povidone iodine (col. 7, line 44) may be used, which is the

combination is polyvinyl pyrrolidone and iodine. Regarding claim 29, note that Teflon rings,

seals, patches, etc., (column 8, lines 16+) and may be permanent (col 8, line 10), which

anticipates the claimed PTFE graft.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Sharon Kennedy whose telephone number is (703) 305-0154.

February 24, 2003